



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/015,703	- -	12/17/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-171	BS01-171 6387 . EXAMINER	
45695	7590	10/06/2006		EXAM		
WITHERS P. O. BOX		FOR BELL SOU	CUFF, MI	CUFF, MICHAEL A		
MARIETT.		0007-1355		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
-	,			3627		

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,703	KIRKPATRICK, MARK A.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Cuff	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 A</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposite and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. epted or b) objected to by the land the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1O-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application of the second in the secon	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/015,703

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. in view of Pong et al.

Hall et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying including the make and model of vehicle on the order for customer identification and the step of a menu signal being sent prior to an order signal.

Hall et al. shows a method and apparatus for processing orders from customers in a mobile environment. A Mobile Customer Premises Equipment (MCPE) 105 (transmitter, PDA) is used to communicate with the supplier (receiver of the order). From column 2, lines 51-52, "the order includes customer identifying information". Figure 6 goes through the ordering process (codes included).

Brown et al. teaches a system for specifying an electronic food menu on a data processing system. Column 7, lines 51-56 show that the menu receiving unit can be a PDA 52 in a mobile environment. Figure 6a and step 126 in figure 7B provide a customized menu signal prior to the order signal in order to provide the customer with better food menu choices.

Based on the teaching of Brown et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Hall et al. ordering processing system to incorporate the providing a customized menu signal prior to the order signal in order to provide the customer with better food menu choices.

Pong et al. teaches, figure 1, an automatic refueling station where (column 6, lines 38-44) make and model are used as identifying information for the vehicle and a customer account number is used to identify the customer. This information is used to better serve the customer in a POS environment.

Based on the teaching of Pong et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Hall et al. system to include the customer's vehicle make and model as part of the customer identifying information in order to better serve the customer in a POS environment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rowe et al. and Hashimoto show systems of interest.

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/29/06

Michael Cuff

September 29, 2006